1	ROBERT S. BREWER, JR.					
2	United States Attorney DAVID J. RAWLS					
3	Assistant U.S. Attorney District of Columbia Bar No. 974620					
4	l Federal Office Building					
	880 Front Street, Room 6293 San Diego, California 92101 Telephone: (619) 546-7966					
5	E-mail: david.rawls@usdoj.gov					
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff					
7	United States of America					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
10	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	Case No. '19CV2311 DMS BGS				
11	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR FORFEITURE				
12	V.	FORFEITURE				
13	2005 INFINITY FX35, CA. LICENSE					
14	6GYJ314, VIN: JNRAS08U75X109043,					
15						
16	Defendant.					
17	By way of complaint against the Def	fendant listed in the caption abo				

By way of complaint against the Defendant listed in the caption above, the United States of America alleges:

- 1. This Court has jurisdiction over this action by virtue of the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Sections 1345 and 1355(a), because the action has been commenced by the United States, and because it is an action for the recovery and enforcement of a forfeiture under an Act of Congress. This Court has *in rem* jurisdiction over the Defendant, because the Defendant was seized in this district, and the acts or omissions giving rise to the forfeiture of the Defendant occurred in this district.
- 2. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to Title 28, United States Code, Section 1395 because the Defendant was found and is located in this district. Venue is also proper in this district pursuant to Title 28, United States Code, Section 1355(b) because the acts and omissions giving rise to this forfeiture action occurred in this district.

The SENTRI Violations

- 3. The United States Customs and Border Protection ("CBP"), is an agency within the United States Department of Homeland Security. CBP is the nation's comprehensive border security agency with a focus on maintaining the nation's boundaries and ports of entry by developing seamless security procedures and ensuring compliance with the nations' immigration, health, and international trade law regulations.
- 4. To facilitate efficient processing of traffic arriving in the United States through ports of entry on the United States land borders, CBP has developed a trusted-traveler program known as the Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspections ("SENTRI"). SENTRI allows for expedited clearance for pre-approved, low-risk travelers upon arrival in the United States, through dedicated special inspection lanes at ports of entry.
- 5. Individuals who wish to be enrolled in the SENTRI program must submit an application, undergo a background investigation, and appear for a personal interview. As early as June 2014, CBP's official website has indicated that individuals may be ineligible for the SENTRI program, if among other things, they have been convicted of any criminal offense or have pending criminal charges or outstanding warrants (to include driving under the influence).¹
- 6. SENTRI lanes are reserved strictly for SENTRI cardholders. To maintain the trusted-traveler program's integrity, and to continue lowering wait times for the SENTRI lanes, CBP has prioritized disincentivizing non-SENTRI travelers from using the SENTRI program's dedicated lanes. CBP identifies this conduct as SENTRI No Tag violations. CBP has disincentivized SENTRI No Tag violations by first having CBP officers issue warnings to violators of possible penalties for repeated violations. CBP officers do in fact assess penalties to repeat violators. The penalties for SENTRI No Tag violations have been codified in Title 19, United States Code, Sections 1436 (b) and 1433.

¹ https://web.archive.org/web/20140606033050/http://www.cbp.gov/travel/trusted-traveler-programs/sentri/sentri-eligibility (last reviewed November 4, 2019); See also https://www.cbp.gov/travel/trusted-traveler-programs/sentri/eligibility (last reviewed November 4, 2019).

7.

4 5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27 28 Otay Mesa, California Port of Entry and the Calexico, California Port of Entry, which all participate in the SENTRI program, and contain SENTRI dedicated lanes. 8.

CBP is responsible for operating the San Ysidro, California Port of Entry,

- On or about February 6, 2015, Ladislav Teshale Sucik ("Sucik"), a United States citizen, entered into the United States from Mexico, through a SENTRI lane at the San Ysidro Port of Entry. Sucik was not, and had never been enrolled in the SENTRI program. A CBP officer warned Sucik about possible future penalties for continuing to use the SENTRI lane without being enrolled in SENTRI. The CBP officer did not issue a penalty or seize Sucik's vehicle.
- 9. On or about February 7, 2015, Sucik submitted a SENTRI membership application to CBP. In his application, Sucik noted that he had two criminal convictions. Specifically, Sucik had been convicted for reckless driving in 2009 and DUI in 2012. On March 30, 2015, CBP sent a letter to Sucik, which stated that Sucik's application for membership in SENTRI was rejected, due to Sucik's criminal convictions.
- 10. On or about April 20, 2016, approximately one month after receiving the SENTRI membership rejection letter from CBP, Sucik entered into the United States from Mexico through a SENTRI lane at the Calexico Port of Entry. A CBP officer informed Sucik of the requirement to be enrolled in the SENTRI program to use the SENTRI lane. The CBP officer did not issue a penalty or seize Sucik's vehicle.
- On or about August 24, 2016, Sucik wrote a letter to CBP, requesting an 11. appeal of the denial of his SENTRI application. Sucik also sent an electronic mail communication to CBP, wherein he inquired as to the status of the SENTRI appeal. On or about April 14, 2017, the CBP Ombudsman's office sustained the denial of Sucik's SENTRI program application.
- On or about November 18, 2017, after Sucik's SENTRI application denial 12. was sustained by the CBP Ombudsman's office, Sucik entered into the United States from Mexico through a SENTRI lane at the San Ysidro Port of Entry. Sucik told a CBP officer that he drove through the SENTRI lane on purpose. The CBP officer informed Sucik that

1

any subsequent unauthorized use of the SENTRI lanes would constitute a violation and could result in fines, penalties, and/or seizure of the vehicle. The CBP officer did not issue a penalty or seize Sucik's vehicle.

On or about July 19, 2019, after having been warned on multiple prior 13. 4 5 occasions about the consequences of continuing to use SENTRI lanes without admission into the program, Sucik entered into the United States from Mexico through a SENTRI 6 Lane at the San Ysidro Port of Entry. Sucik entered into the SENTRI lane, while driving 7 a vehicle. The CBP officer at the SENTRI lane identified the vehicle Sucik was driving as 8 the Defendant. The CBP officer identified the vehicle as the Defendant, by among other 9 10 things, observing the license plate on the vehicle and observing the aesthetic features on the vehicle. Sucik admitted to the CBP officer that he had previously used the SENTRI 11 lane to cross into the United States from Mexico. The CBP officer at the SENTRI lane 12 received a computer generated alert indicating that this was Sucik's third (3rd) SENTRI 13 Sucik was referred to secondary inspection. In secondary inspection, a 14 15 CBP officer performed a vehicle seizure on the Defendant, for a SENTRI No Tag violation. Sucik was also assessed a penalty of \$5,000 USD for a SENTRI No Tag violation, and was 16 provided payment instructions. Sucik was presented with Customs Form 4609 and 17 Election of Proceedings, which he refused to sign without an attorney present. A CBP 18

SENTRI No Tag violations.

14. The current outstanding balance on Sucik's penalty is approximately \$4,750 USD.

officer advised Sucik that Sucik would be assessed a fine of \$10,000 for any subsequent

15. Sucik is not the registered owner of the Defendant. On or about July 22, 2019, Sucik sent a letter to CBP, stating that while the Defendant is not registered in his name, he had just purchased it, and was on his way to register it. Sucik later sent additional supporting documentation to CBP to support his assertion.

27

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

COUNT 1

The allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 15 above are incorporated

2005 INFINITY FX35, CA. LICENSE 6GYJ314, VIN: JNRAS08U75X109043

3 4

herein by reference and included as a part hereof.

5 6

7

8 9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

27

17. The Defendant constitutes a conveyance used in connection with a violation of Title 19, United States Code, Section 1433, which requires the person in charge of an arriving vehicle to arrive only at border crossing points designated by the U.S. Department

of Homeland Security, and present the vehicle, and all persons and merchandise, for

inspection.

16.

By virtue of the aforementioned acts and premises alleged herein, either singly 18. or in combination, the Defendant is subject to forfeiture under Title 19, United States Code, Section 1436(b).

The Defendant is in the custody of the United States, having been seized pursuant to legal process prior to the commencement of this action. The United States respectfully requests the Court authorize the United States Customs and Border Protection (or its designee) to take custody and control of the Defendant pursuant to Rule G(3)(b) of the Supplemental Rules for Admiralty or Maritime Claims and Asset Forfeiture Actions.

WHEREFORE, the United States prays that due process issue to enforce the forfeiture of the Defendant, and that due notice be given to all interested parties to appear and show cause why said forfeiture should not be declared.

DATED: December 4, 2019

ROBERT S. BREWER, JR. United States Attorney

s/David J. Rawls Assistant U.S. Attorney

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

the civil docket sheet. (SEE h	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE PC	OKWI.)		OOVEON BING BO		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS			
Jnited States of Americ	a		2005 INFINITY FX35, CA. LICENSE 6GYJ314, VIN: JNRAS08U75X109043			
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.			
(E	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)					
•	e, Address, and Telephone Number)		Attorneys (If Known)			
AUSA David J. Rawls, I		0404 0000				
	t, Room 6293, San Diego, CA 92 DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		TIZENCHID OF D	DINCIDAL DADTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
			For Diversity Cases Only)		and One Box for Defendant)	
■ U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizer	n of This State	 TF DEF 1 □ 1 Incorporated or Prior of Business In This 		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Ite)		n of Another State	2		
			n or Subject of a eign Country	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FO	RFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 362 Persona □ Med. M Liability □ 365 Persona □ Product Liability □ 340 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ Product Liability □ 385 Property	LINJURY 610 al Injury - 620 Aalpractice 622 al Injury - 630 Sersonal 630 Sersonal 650 Sersonal 650 Sersonal 650 Sersonal 710 Sersonal 710 Sersonal 720 Sersonal 730 Sersonal 740 Se	O Agriculture O Other Food & Drug Trug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 O Liquor Laws O R.R. & Truck O Airline Regs. O Occupational Safety/Health O Other LABOR O Fair Labor Standards Act O Labor/Mgmt. Relations O Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act O Railway Labor Act O Cher Labor Litigation I Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION O Habeas Corpus O Habeas Corpus Alien Detainee O Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 □ PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark □ 840 Trademark □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) □ FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
又 1 Original □ 2 R	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from	rt Reop	ened another (speci	2.7		
VI CAUSE OF ACTU	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which 19 U.S.C. Section 1433	ch you are filing (I	Do not cite jurisdiction:	al statutes unless diversity):		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Brief description of cause: Failure to Report Arrival				+	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS A UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	ACTION DE	EMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE 12/04/2019	signatur s/ David	RE OF ATTORNEY O	DF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY						
RECEIPT#	MOUNT APPLYIN	NG IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	DGE	

VERIFICATION

- I, Nicolas Gonzales Jr, state and declare as follows:
- I am an officer with the United States Customs and Border Protection, and have read reports and talked to the federal law enforcement officers involved in this investigation.
 - I have read the foregoing Complaint For Forfeiture and know its contents. 2.
- 3. The facts set forth in the Complaint For Forfeiture are based upon my own knowledge or were facts furnished to me by official Government sources.

Based on this information, I believe the allegations in the Complaint For Forfeiture to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Executed on November 14, 2019.

Nicolas Gonzales Jt LCBP Supervisory Officer
UNITED STATES CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION